

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ha (US 6,081,307), and claims 6, 13, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Ha. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The distinct feature of the present invention from Ha is that at least one of the static electricity preventing units is directly connected to a source driver. The Examiner stated that this technical feature is shown in Ha, but this technical feature is not shown in Ha or in any cited reference.

In Ha, the static electricity preventing units are formed in all the common voltage lines. That is, Ha fails to show the technical features of the present invention that at least one of the static electricity preventing units is directly connected to a source driver.

Although the structure that the static electricity preventing unit is not formed in one common voltage line is disclosed in FIG. 5 of Ha, this static electricity preventing unit was erroneously omitted from the figures. That is, the static electricity preventing units in Ha are formed in all the common voltage lines, and the fact that only one static electricity preventing unit is not drawn in FIG. 5 is clearly a mistake.

Ha does not and cannot teach that the static electricity preventing unit is not formed in one common voltage line, since the static electricity preventing units are formed in all the common voltage lines.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Ha neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 23, and hence dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 24.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: June 21, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000